

*An unpublished Ghazal by Háfiz.—By H. BLOCHMANN, M. A.,
Calcutta Madrasah.*

In the Proceedings for November 1874, (p. 208), I noticed a MS. collection of choice verses containing an autograph of Prince Khurram (Sháhjahán). Among the poems, the following *ghazal* by Háfiz is given, which I have not seen in any MS. or printed edition of his *Díwán*. The style is easily recognized as that of Háfiz. (Metre, long *hazaj*.)

بحمد اللّٰه که بازم دیدن رویت میسر شد *
 ز خورشید جمالت دیدۀ بختم منصور شد
 بصورتخانهٔ دل روز تنهائی وصالت را *
 بدان صورت که با خود نقش می بستم منصور شد
 مرا از لطف تا بر سر فکندی سایهٔ رحمت *
 همای بخت و دولت بر سر من سایه گستر شد
 نوید مقدمت دادند دام جان بشکرانه *
 که آنم موجب عیش دل اندوه پرور شد
 ز روی مردمی جانا قدم بر چشم حافظ نه *
 که جایست در درون دیدۀ روشن مقرر شد

1. Thanks be to God that a sight of thy face has again been granted me: the sun of thy beauty lights up the eye of my destiny.

2. In the gallery of my heart I painted the day of my loneliness in those (bright) colours in which I paint to myself the day of meeting thee.

3. When in thy love thou castest upon my head the shadow of mercy, the phoenix of fortune and success casts his shadow upon me.

4. The news of thy arrival was brought to me, and I gave up my heart to thanksgiving; for this was an occasion of joy for my grief-fostering heart.

5. Put boldly, O love, thy foot upon the eye of Háfiz; for within his beaming eye a place has been made for thee.



A Grammar of the Language of Eastern Turkistán.—By R. B. SHAW,
Political Agent.

INTRODUCTORY.

The Turkish tongues are of singular interest to the student of language. They are to him, what the mountains which surround their birth-place are to the geologist; who there can observe many of the vastest operations of nature and their results, naked as it were, and not veiled by the superficial covering which in other less barren countries makes the investigation and tracing out of the various formation so laborious a task.

The Indo-European languages are like an ancient building, where frequent restorations have interfered with the original design, and where finally a universal coat of plaster has destroyed all outward distinction between old and new. In the Turanian structure, on the other hand every tool-mark is still fresh, the places where the scaffolding has rested, are still visible, and we can almost trace each course of the stone-work to its origin in the quarry whence it was hewn.

It may seem strange that a language developed by the rude and nomad tribes of Central Asia, who in their own home have never known how to reduce it to rule (or rather to distinguish the laws through which they themselves had unconsciously formed it), should present in fact an example of symmetry in complexity such as few of the more cultivated forms of speech exhibit. Although its own people would have one believe that it is subject to no rule and almost purely arbitrary (their only notion of grammar being that of Arabic and Persian with which the Turkí cannot be made to fit); yet in reality a few simple and transparent rules suffice to account for all its permutations. These rules, possessing an accumulative power, are enough to produce the immense variety of forms noticeable in the Eastern Turkí.

We are now learning to believe that even in languages such as Greek, German, or even English, every seeming irregularity is really the result of laws, some of which we know and can trace in their action, and some of which are yet to be discovered. But in Turkí we can *see* them; it is as if the centuries were to flow backwards, and we could watch the building of the Pyramids and solve by ocular demonstration the doubts of the learned as to the method by which the vast blocks were transported from the quarries, and placed in their present positions. We can even detect in some instances a commencement in this Turanian tongue, of the process by which the Aryan languages have been polished down and enamelled, as it were, till they reached their present condition.

Viewed in this light the study of the Eastern Túrki is seen to have an interest which is not to be measured by the amount of the commercial or other intercourse likely to be facilitated by it. For the Turkish tongues, a journey eastward is pretty nearly equivalent to a study of the earlier forms of an Indo-European language. In either case we get nearer to the source ; and the less literary character of the former makes it easier to approach its origin in space than in time. Rémusat, in his “Langues Tartares”*, truly says : “Le dialecte de Constantinople est celui de tous qui s’est le plus enrichi, je pourrais dire appauvri, par l’introduction de mots Arabes et Persans ; et l’on n’en rencontre que fort peu dans la langue des Túrks voisins de la Chine, où l’on peut, pour cette raison, espérer de retrouver l’antique langue Túrke dans un état plus voisin de sa pureté primitive.”

Valikhanoff (the son of a Kirghiz chief in the Russian service, whose name, Valí Khán, with the affixed Russian patronymic ending *off*, is significant of Russia’s progress among those tribes) writes :† “The language.....spoken in Káshghar is altogether unknown to European savants”, and Prof. Vámbéry, in quoting him, adds that this language “has incontestably the most primitive words and formations amongst all Turkish forms of speech.”‡

In the Turkish of Káshghar and Yarkand (which some European linguists have called *Uighur*,§ a name unknown to the inhabitants of those towns, who know their tongue simply as *Túrki*), we can obtain a glimpse backwards at a state of the language when the noun (which in Western Turkish is almost inflected) was but a rude block, labelled if necessary by attaching other nouns, &c., to show its relation to the remaining words of a sentence, as in Chinese. Of these attached words we can still see the meaning and special force, and can even use some of them as independent parts of speech (see below in Chapter III and Chapter VII, Numerals). It requires scientific dissection to extract and realize the meaning of the genitive element in the Latin word “rosæ,” for instance ; but the Túrki genitive *ulus-nung* (“tribe’s,” lit. “tribe property”) bears its origin on its face, and it cannot be very long ago that the word “*nung*” or “*neng*” would have been used freely to mean “goods” or “possessions”, as it is in the Kudatku-Bilik|| (translated by Prof. Vám-

* Page 250, edition 1820.

† See Messrs. Michel’s “Russians in Central Asia”.

‡ Vámbéry’s “Chagataische Sprach-studien”, p. 3.

§ This would seem in many cases to be a misnomer as applied to the modern language of Káshghar.

|| E. g. *üla neng* “bestow (thy) property.”

béry). The mark of the accusative *ni* is at the present day in common use as an independent pronoun signifying "what".

When we follow these affixes into Western Turkish, they seem to have lost their initial consonants, and to have sunk into mere inflectional terminations.*

At the early period above referred to, the verb was perhaps a mere noun of action, destitute of any conjugation, although afterwards labelled by means of certain syllables (originally independent words) to indicate the several times and modes of the action. Such compound words, which could hardly be considered verbs, would apply equally to the *agent*, the *action*, and the *object* acted upon. In this stage the Túrki verb would have answered to the description of the same part of speech in an allied tongue: "The Tibetan verbs must be regarded as denoting, not an action or suffering or condition of any subject, but merely a *coming to pass*... they are destitute of what is called in our languages the active or passive voice, as well as of the discrimination of persons, and show nothing beyond a rather poor capability of expressing the most indispensable distinctions of tense and mood.....The inflection of verbs...is done in three different ways:.....(*c*), by adding [to the Root] various monosyllabic appendices, the Infinitive, Participles, and so called Gerunds are formed." [Dr. Jaeschke's Tibetan Grammar, printed at the Moravian Mission Press at Kyelang, in British Láhaul, Chapter VI, §§ 29 and 30], (see also page 262, below).

A further development of the language would consist in also labelling these verbal nouns with the several pronouns or the corresponding possessive affixes (according as the desired sense might require) to point out the subject of the action; and thus were at last obtained several tenses of a real conjugation.

* This will be seen by an inspection of the following comparative statement:—

	Root.	Káshghari Post-positions.	Osmanli terminations.
Nom.	<i>ât</i>
Gen.....	<i>ât</i>	<i>ning</i>	<i>-ung (uñ)</i>
Dat.	<i>ât</i>	<i>gañ</i>	<i>-añ</i>
Acc.	<i>ât</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>-i</i>
Abl.	<i>ât</i>	<i>din</i> &c.	<i>-tín</i> &c.

All these stages of the Túrki verb formation co-exist in the present language of Yárkand. If one asks a man whether he has seen so-and-so, he replies: “*körgan*.” This word may denote equally “the person who sees”, “the thing seen”, and “the action of seeing.” But in a case of ambiguity, or for greater emphasis, he might also answer: *körgan-im bár* (lit. “*my* seeing exists”), or *körgan-man* (lit. “*I* the seer”). In one case the possessive (*im* “*my*”), and in the other the personal pronoun (*man* “*I*”), is affixed; and thus the 1st Person singular of two (Indefinite) Past Tenses is formed. These are the two typical modes of forming the persons of a tense, and there is no other.

Out of such simple materials is the whole Turkish conjugation produced, which Prof. Max Müller compares to a tree with innumerable branches, each of which is bowed down to the earth by the weight of the fruit which it bears. The above form, *kör-gan*, is but one of the several verbal nouns produced from the root *kör*; the same root when labelled with other affixes, instead of *gan*, denoting different times (tenses) or modes (moods) for the action, forms various verbal nouns and participles. These participles, either attached to pronouns as above, or in composition with auxiliary participles which are so attached, produce the whole of the 270 (and odd) tense-persons of which a primary Túrki verb conjugation consists.

Rémusat charges the Eastern Túrki (Ouigour) with employing no true auxiliary verb, *i. e.*, according to his definition, an auxiliary personal future or past tense applied to a participle, either *future* or *past* (not *present*). “Il résulte de cette combinaison, des plusque-parfaits, des futurs, des parfaits composés, toutes choses inconnues en Ouigour.”

A further acquaintance has revealed to us, at least in modern Ouigour (“actuellement la langue des habitants des villes depuis Khasigar jusqu’à Kamoul”), all these things which M. de Rémusat had missed. Such tenses as *qelip-idim*, “I had done”, *qelip-bolurman*, “I shall have done”, *qeladurghan-boldum*, “I have determined to do” (lit. “I have become about to do”), answer completely to the above definition. Thus the Túrki tongue leaves nothing to be desired in the way of tense varieties.

But this is not all; for the root itself previous to the addition of any tense or mood terminations may have its meaning or application modified by other affixes (producing secondary Verbs, Passive, Causative, Reciprocativ, &c.). By the accumulative faculty of the Túrki tongue these produce numbers of fresh forms. Like a gambler who “doubles all round”, each of them adds to the former stock of words a number equal to that which existed without it. Going round to each tense of the original verb and of its compounds, it lays down another by its side. One peculiarity of the process called “playing double or quits” is, as